arXiv:1405.3339v1 [math.DS] 14 May 2014

The Historic Set of Ergodic Averages in Some Nonuniformly Hyperbolic Systems

Zheng Yin[1], Ercai Chen[1,2*], Xiaoyao Zhou[3]

1 School of Mathematical Sciences and Institute of Mathematics, Nanjing Normal University,

Nanjing 210023, Jiangsu, P.R.China

2 Center of Nonlinear Science, Nanjing University,

Nanjing 210093, Jiangsu, P.R.China

3 Department of Mathematics, University of Science and Technology of China,

Hefei, Anhui,230026, P.R.China

e-mail: zhengyinmail@126.com,

ecchen@njnu.edu.cn,

zhouxiaoyaodeyouxian@126.com

Abstract. This article is devoted to the study of the historic set of ergodic averages in some nonuniformly hyperbolic systems. In particular, our results hold for the robust classes of multidimensional nonuniformly expanding local diffeomorphisms and Viana maps.

Keywords and phrases: Historic set, Non-uniform Specification.

1 Introduction and Preliminaries

(X, d, T) (or (X, T) for short) is a topological dynamical system means that (X, d) is a compact metric space together with a continuous self-map $T : X \to X$. For a continuous function $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}, X$ can be divided into the following two parts:

$$X = \bigcup_{\alpha\in\mathbb{R}} \left\{ x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i x) = \alpha \right\} \cup \left\{ x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i x) \text{ does not exist } \right\}.$$

* Corresponding author

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 37B40, 28D20

The level set $\left\{x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i x) = \alpha\right\}$ is so-called multifractal decomposition sets of ergodic averages of φ in multifractal analysis. There are fruitful results about the descriptions of the structure (Hausdorff dimension or topological entropy or topological pressure) of these level sets in topological dynamical systems. Early studies of the level sets was about their dimensions and topological entropy. See Barreira & Saussol [3], Barreira, Saussol & Schmeling [4], Olsen [16], Olsen & Winter [17], Takens & Verbitskiy [24], Zhou, Chen & Cheng [33] and Pfister & Sullivan [21]. Recently, the topological pressures of the level sets has also been investigated. See Thompson [26], Pei & Chen [18] and Zhou & Chen [32].

The set $\widehat{X}(\varphi, T) := \left\{x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i x) \text{ does not exist } \right\}$ is called the historic set of ergodic averages of φ. This terminology was introduced by Ruelle in [22]. It is also called non-typical points (see [1]), irregular set (see [25, 27]) and divergence points (see [5, 16, 17]). If this limit $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i x)$ does not exist, it follows that 'partial averages' $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i x)$ keep change considerably so that their values give information about the epoch to which n belongs. The problem, whether there are persistent classes of smooth dynamical systems such that the set of initial states which give rise to orbits with historic behavior has positive Lebesgue measure was discussed by Ruelle in [22] and Takens in [23]. By Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, $\widehat{X}(\varphi, T)$ is not detectable from the point of view of an invariant measure, i.e., for any invariant measure μ,

$$\mu(\widehat{X}(\varphi, T)) = 0.$$

Hence, at first, the set $\widehat{X}(\varphi, T)$ has until recently been considered of little interest in dynamical systems and geometric measure theory. However, recent work [6, 8, 10] has changed such attitudes. They have shown that in many cases the set can have full Hausdorff dimension, i.e.,

$$\dim_H(\widehat{X}(\varphi, T)) = \dim_H(X).$$

Barreira and Schmeling [1] confirmed this in the uniformly hyperbolic setting in symbolic dynamics. In 2005, Chen, Kupper and Shu [5] proved that $\widehat{X}(\varphi, T)$ is either empty or carries full entropy for maps with the specification property. Thompson [25] extended it to topological pressure for maps with the specification property. Zhou and Chen [32] also investigated the multifractal analysis for the historic set in topological dynamical systems with g-almost product property.

Now, nonuniformly hyperbolic systems attract more and more attentions. We refer the readers to Barreira & Pesin [2], Chung & Takahasi [7], Johansson, Jordan, Oberg &

Pollicott [11], Jordan & Rams [12], Liang, Liao, Sun & Tian [13], Oliveira [14], Oliveira & Viana [15] and references therein for recent results in nonuniformly hyperbolic systems. It is well known that the specification property plays an important role in some uniformly hyperbolic dynamical systems. The notion of specification is slightly weaker than the one introduced by Bowen that requires any finite sequence of pieces of orbit is well approximated by periodic orbits. It implies that the dynamical systems have some mixing property. One should mention that other mild forms of specification were introduced by Pfister & Sullivan [21] and Thompson [27] to the study of multifractal formalism for Birkhoff averages associated to beta-shifts, and by Pfister & Sullivan [20], Yamamoto [31] and Varandas [28] to study large deviations. This article will use the weak form of specification introduced by Varandas [28] in a nonuniformly hyperbolic context.

Denote by $M(X)$ and $M(X,T)$ the set of all Borel probability measures on X and the collection of all T-invariant Borel probability measures, respectively. It is well known that $M(X)$ and $M(X,T)$ equipped with weak* topology are both convex, compact spaces.

Definition 1.1. [28] *We say that (T,m) satisfies the non-uniform specification property with a time lag of $p(x,n,\epsilon)$ if there exists $\delta > 0$ such that for m-almost every x and every $0 < \epsilon < \delta$ there exists an integer $p(x,n,\epsilon) \geq 1$ satisfying*

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} p(x,n,\epsilon) = 0$$

and so that the following holds: given points $x_1, \cdots, x_k$ in a full m-measure set and positive integers $n_1, \cdots, n_k$, if $p_i \geq p(x_i, n_i, \epsilon)$ then there exists z that ϵ-shadows the orbits of each x_i during n_i iterates with a time lag of $p(x_i,n_i,\epsilon)$ in between $T^{n_i}(x_i)$ and x_{i+1}, that is

$$z \in B_{n_1}(x_1,\epsilon) \text{ and } T^{n_1+p_1+\cdots+n_{i-1}+p_{i-1}}(z) \in B_{n_i}(x_i,\epsilon)$$

for every $2 \leq i \leq k$, where

$$B_n(x,\epsilon) = \{y : d_n(x,y) < \epsilon\} := \left\{ y : \max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} \{d(T^i x, T^i y)\} < \epsilon \right\}.$$

We assume that the shadowing property holds on a set K with a time lag $p(x,n,\epsilon)$ throughout the paper. From definition 1.1, we know for any $x \in K$ and $0 < \epsilon_1 < \epsilon_2$, $p(x,n,\epsilon_1) \geq p(x,n,\epsilon_2)$. Hence for any $x \in K$ and $\epsilon > 0$, $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{p(x,n,\epsilon)}{n} = 0$. Obviouly, K is T-invariant. Let $M(K,T)$ denote the subset of $M(X,T)$ for which the measures μ satisfy $\mu(K) = 1$ and $E(K,T)$ denote those which are ergodic.

Definition 1.2. [19] *Suppose $Z \subset X$ be an arbitrary Borel set and $\psi \in C(X)$. Let $\Gamma_n(Z,\epsilon)$ be the collection of all finite or countable covers of Z by sets of the form*

$B_m(x,\epsilon)$, *with* $m \geq n$. *Let* $S_n\psi(x) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \psi(T^i x)$. *Set*

$$M(Z,t,\psi,n,\epsilon) := \inf_{\mathcal{C}\in\Gamma_n(Z,\epsilon)} \left\{ \sum_{B_m(x,\epsilon)\in\mathcal{C}} \exp(-tm + \sup_{y\in B_m(x,\epsilon)} S_m\psi(y)) \right\},$$

and

$$M(Z,t,\psi,\epsilon) = \lim_{n\to\infty} M(Z,t,\psi,n,\epsilon).$$

Then there exists a unique number $P(Z,\psi,\epsilon)$ *such that*

$$P(Z,\psi,\epsilon) = \inf\{t : M(Z,t,\psi,\epsilon) = 0\} = \sup\{t : M(Z,t,\psi,\epsilon) = \infty\}.$$

$P(Z,\psi) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} P(Z,\psi,\epsilon)$ *is called the topological pressure of* Z *with respect to* ψ.

It is obvious that the following hold:

(1) $P(Z_1,\psi) \leq P(Z_2,\psi)$ for any $Z_1 \subset Z_2 \subset X$;

(2) $P(Z,\psi) = \sup_i P(Z_i,\psi)$, where $Z = \bigcup_i Z_i \subset X$.

Now, we state the main result of this article as follows:

Theorem 1.1. *Let* (X,T) *be a topological dynamical system. Assume* (T,m) *satisfies non-uniform specification property. Assume that* $\varphi \in C(X)$ *satisfies* $\inf_{\mu\in M(K,T)} \int \varphi d\mu < \sup_{\mu\in M(K,T)} \int \varphi d\mu$, *then* $\widehat{X}(\varphi,T) \neq \emptyset$ *and for all* $\psi \in C(X)$,

$$P(\widehat{X}(\varphi,T),\psi) \geq \sup\left\{ h_\mu + \int \psi d\mu : \mu \in M(K,T) \right\},$$

where

$$\widehat{X}(\varphi,T) = \left\{ x \in X : \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \varphi(T^i x) \text{ does not exist} \right\}.$$

If there exists $\mu \in M(K,T)$ *such that* μ *is a equilibrium state for* T *with respect to potential* ψ, *then we have* $P(\widehat{X}(\varphi,T),\psi) = P(X,\psi)$.

Theorem 1.2. *Let us assume the hypotheses of theorem 1.1. Let*

$$\mathbf{C} := \sup\left\{ h_\mu + \int \psi d\mu : \mu \in M(K,T) \right\}.$$

We assume further that $P(X,\psi)$ *is finite and for all* $\gamma > 0$, *there exist ergodic measures* $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in M(K,T)$ *satisfying*

1. $h_{\mu_i} + \int \psi d\mu_i > \mathbf{C} - \gamma$ *for* $i = 1, 2$,

2. $\int \varphi d\mu_1 \neq \int \varphi d\mu_2$.

Then $P(\widehat{X}(\varphi, T), \psi) \geq \mathbf{C}$. *If there exists* $\mu \in M(K, T)$ *such that* μ *is a equilibrium state for* T *with respect to potential* ψ, *then we have* $P(\widehat{X}(\varphi, T), \psi) = P(X, \psi)$.

At first, we prove Theorem 1.2 and then explain how to remove additional hypothesis to obtain theorem 1.1. The case that $P(X, \psi)$ is infinite can be included in our proof.

2 Proof of Main Result

Before showing the lower bound, we give some important lemmas as follows.

Lemma 2.1. [25, 26] *Let* (X, d) *be a compact metric space,* $T : X \to X$ *be a continuous map and* μ *be an ergodic invariant measure. For* $\epsilon > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ *and* $\psi \in C(X)$, *define*

$$N^{\mu}(\psi, \gamma, \epsilon, n) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{x \in S} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \psi(T^i x) \right\} \right\},$$

where the infimum is taken over all sets S *which* (n, ϵ) *span some set* Z *with* $\mu(Z) \geq 1 - \gamma$. *we have*

$$h_{\mu} + \int \psi d\mu = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N^{\mu}(\psi, \gamma, \epsilon, n).$$

The formula remains true if we replace the $\liminf$ *by* $\limsup$.

Lemma 2.2. [25, 26] *(Generalised Pressure Distribution Principle) Let* (X, d, T) *be a topological dynamical system. Let* $Z \subset X$ *be an arbitrary Borel set. Suppose there exist* $\epsilon > 0$ *and* $s \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that one can find a sequence of Borel probability measures* μ_k, *a constant* $K > 0$ *and an integer* N *satisfying*

$$\limsup_{k \to \infty} \mu_k(B_n(x, \epsilon)) \leq K \exp(-ns + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \psi(T^i x))$$

for every ball $B_n(x, \epsilon)$ *such that* $B_n(x, \epsilon) \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ *and* $n \geq N$. *Furthermore, assume that at least one limit measure* ν *of the sequence* μ_k *satisfies* $\nu(Z) > 0$. *Then* $P(Z, \psi, \epsilon) \geq s$.

Fix a small $\gamma > 0$, and take the measures μ_1 and μ_2 provided by hypothesis. Choose $\delta > 0$ so small that

$$\left| \int \varphi d\mu_1 - \int \varphi d\mu_2 \right| > 4\delta.$$

Let $\rho : \mathbb{N} \to \{1, 2\}$ be given by $\rho(k) = (k + 1)(\text{mod } 2) + 1$. For $\epsilon > 0$, by Egorov's theorem and Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, we can choose a strictly decreasing sequence $\delta_k \to 0$ with $\delta_1 < \delta$ and a strictly increasing sequence $l_k \to \infty$ so the sets

$$X_k := \left\{ x \in K : \frac{p(x, n, \epsilon/4)}{n} < \frac{1}{2^k} \text{ for all } n \geq l_k \right\} \tag{2.1}$$

and

$$Y_k := \left\{ x \in K : \left| \frac{1}{n} S_n \varphi(x) - \int \varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)} \right| < \delta_k \text{ for all } n \geq l_k \right\} \tag{2.2}$$

satisfy $\mu_{\rho(k)}(X_k) > 1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and $\mu_{\rho(k)}(Y_k) > 1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}$ for every k. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_{\rho(k)}(X_k \cap Y_k) > 1 - \gamma$.

Lemma 2.3. *For any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a sequence $n_k \to \infty$ and a countable collection of finite sets Θ_k such that each Θ_k is an $(n_k, 4\epsilon)$ separated set for $X_k \cap Y_k$ and $M_k := \sum_{x \in \Theta_k} \exp\left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n_k - 1} \psi(T^i x) \right\}$ satisfying*

$$M_k \geq \exp(n_k(\mathbf{C} - 4\gamma)).$$

Furthermore, the sequence n_k can be chosen so that $n_k \geq l_k$ and for any $x \in \Theta_k$, $\frac{p(x, n_k, \epsilon/4)}{n_k} < \frac{1}{2^k}$.

Proof. By lemma 2.1, we can choose ϵ sufficiently small so

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N^{\mu_i}(\psi, \gamma, 4\epsilon, n) \geq h_{\mu_i} + \int \psi d\mu_i \geq \mathbf{C} - 2\gamma \text{ for } i = 1, 2.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$Q_n(X_k \cap Y_k, \psi, 4\epsilon) = \inf \left\{ \sum_{x \in S} \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \psi(T^i x) \right\} : S \text{ is } (n, 4\epsilon) \text{ spanning set for } X_k \cap Y_k \right\},$$

$$P_n(X_k \cap Y_k, \psi, 4\epsilon) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{x \in S} \exp \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \psi(T^i x) \right\} : S \text{ is } (n, 4\epsilon) \text{ separated set for } X_k \cap Y_k \right\}.$$

Since $\mu_{\rho(k)}(X_k \cap Y_k) > 1 - \gamma$ for every k, we have

$$P_n(X_k \cap Y_k, \psi, 4\epsilon) \geq Q_n(X_k \cap Y_k, \psi, 4\epsilon) \geq N^{\mu_i}(\psi, \gamma, 4\epsilon, n).$$

Let $M(k, n) = P_n(X_k \cap Y_k, \psi, 4\epsilon)$. For each k, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log M(k, n) \geq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N^{\mu_{\rho(k)}}(\psi, \gamma, 4\epsilon, n) \geq \mathbf{C} - 2\gamma.$$

We choose a sequence $n_k \to \infty$ such that $n_k \geq l_k$ and

$$\frac{1}{n_k} \log M(k, n_k) \geq \mathbf{C} - 3\gamma.$$

For each k, let Θ_k be a $(n_k, 4\epsilon)$ separated set for $X_k \cap Y_k$ which satisfies

$$\frac{1}{n_k} \log \left\{ \sum_{x \in \Theta_k} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n_k - 1} \psi(T^i x) \right\} \right\} \geq \frac{1}{n_k} \log M(k, n_k) - \gamma.$$

Let $M_k := \sum_{x \in \Theta_k} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^{n_k-1} \psi(T^i x) \right\}$, then

$$\frac{1}{n_k} \log M_k \geq \frac{1}{n_k} \log M(k, n_k) - \gamma \geq \mathbf{C} - 4\gamma,$$

the desired results follows. □

We choose ϵ so small that $\mathrm{Var}(\psi, \epsilon) := \sup\{|\psi(x) - \psi(y)| : d(x, y) < \epsilon\} < \gamma$, and $\mathrm{Var}(\varphi, \epsilon) := \sup\{|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| : d(x, y) < \epsilon\} < \frac{\delta}{4}$. We fix all the ingredients as before.

2.0.1 Construction of the fractal F

Let $n_0 = 0$. Let us choose a sequence with $N_0 = 0$ and N_k increasing to ∞ sufficiently quickly so that

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{n_{k+1} + \max\limits_{x \in \Theta_{k+1}} p(x, n_{k+1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4})}{N_k} = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{N_1(n_1 + \max\limits_{x \in \Theta_1} p(x, n_1, \frac{\epsilon}{4})) + \cdots + N_k(n_k + \max\limits_{x \in \Theta_k} p(x, n_k, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))}{N_{k+1}} = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

We enumerate the points in the set Θ_i and consider the set $\Theta_i^{N_i}$. Let $\underline{x}_i = (x_1^i, \cdots, x_{N_i}^i) \in \Theta_i^{N_i}$. For any $(\underline{x}_1, \cdots, \underline{x}_k) \in \Theta_1^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \Theta_k^{N_k}$, by the non-uniform specification property, we have

$$B(\underline{x}_1, \cdots, \underline{x}_k) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{k} \bigcap_{j=1}^{N_i} T^{-\sum_{l=0}^{i-1} N_l (n_l + \max\limits_{x \in \Theta_l} p(x, n_l, \frac{\epsilon}{4})) - (j-1)(n_i + \max\limits_{x \in \Theta_i} p(x, n_i, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))} B_{n_i}(x_j^i, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \neq \emptyset.$$

We define F_k by

$$F_k = \bigcup \{ \overline{B(\underline{x}_1, \cdots, \underline{x}_k)} : (\underline{x}_1, \cdots, \underline{x}_k) \in \Theta_1^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \Theta_k^{N_k} \}.$$

Obviously, F_k is compact and $F_{k+1} \subset F_k$. Define $F = \cap_{k=1}^{\infty} F_k$.

Lemma 2.4. *For any $p \in F$, $\lim\limits_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{t_k} \sum\limits_{i=0}^{t_k-1} \varphi(T^i p)$ does not exist, where $t_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k} N_i(n_i + \max\limits_{x\in\Theta_i} p(x, n_i, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))$.*

Proof. Choose $p \in F$, then for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $p \in F_k$. Let $p_k = T^{t_{k-1}}(p)$. Then there exists $(x_1^k, \cdots x_{N_k}^k) \in \Theta_k^{N_k}$ such that

$$p_k \in \bigcap_{j=1}^{N_k} T^{-(j-1)(n_k + \max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\frac{\epsilon}{4}))} \overline{B_{n_k}}(x_j^k, \frac{\epsilon}{4}).$$

Let $a_j = (j-1)(n_k + \max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x, n_k, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| S_{N_k(n_k+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\frac{\epsilon}{4}))}\varphi(p_k) - N_k(n_k + \max_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\frac{\epsilon}{4})) \int \varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)} \right| \\
\leq &\left| \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} S_{n_k}\varphi(T^{a_j}p_k) - N_k n_k \int \varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)} \right| + N_k \max_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\frac{\epsilon}{4})(\|\varphi\| + \int \varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)}) \\
\leq &\sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \left| S_{n_k}\varphi(T^{a_j}p_k) - S_{n_k}\varphi(x_j^k) \right| + \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} \left| S_{n_k}\varphi(x_j^k) - n_k \int \varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)} \right| \\
&+ N_k \max_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\frac{\epsilon}{4})(\|\varphi\| + \int \varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)}) \\
\leq &n_k N_k \{\mathrm{Var}(\varphi, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) + \delta_k\} + N_k \max_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\frac{\epsilon}{4})\{\|\varphi\| + \int \varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathrm{Var}(\varphi, \epsilon) < \frac{\delta}{4}$, then for sufficiently large k, we have

$$\left| \frac{S_{N_k(n_k+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))}\varphi(p_k)}{N_k(n_k + \max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))} - \int \varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)} \right| \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

One can readily verify that $\frac{N_k(n_k+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))}{t_k} \to 1$. Thus for sufficiently large k, we have $\left| \frac{N_k(n_k+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))}{t_k} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{\delta}{4\|\varphi\|}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \frac{1}{t_k} S_{t_k}\varphi(p) - \frac{S_{N_k(n_k+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))}\varphi(p_k)}{N_k(n_k + \max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))} \right| \\
\leq &\left| \frac{1}{t_k} S_{t_k - N_k(n_k+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))}\varphi(p) \right| + \\
&\left| \frac{S_{N_k(n_k+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))}\varphi(p_k)}{N_k(n_k + \max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))} \left(\frac{N_k(n_k + \max\limits_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x,n_k,\epsilon/4))}{t_k} - 1 \right) \right| \\
\leq &\frac{\delta}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since for sufficiently large k,

$$\left|\frac{1}{t_k}\sum_{i=0}^{t_k-1}\varphi(T^i p)-\int\varphi d\mu_{\rho(k)}\right|\leq\delta<\frac{\left|\int\varphi d\mu_1-\int\varphi d\mu_2\right|}{4},$$

the desired results follows. □

2.0.2 Construction of a Special Sequence of Measures μ_k

For each $\underline{x}=(\underline{x}_1,\cdots,\underline{x}_k)\in\Theta_1^{N_1}\times\cdots\times\Theta_k^{N_k}$, we choose one point $z=z(\underline{x})$ such that $z\in B(\underline{x}_1,\cdots,\underline{x}_k)$. Let L_k be the set of all points constructed in this way. The following lemma shows that $\#L_k=\#\Theta_1^{N_1}\times\cdots\times\#\Theta_k^{N_k}$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\underline{x}$ and $\underline{y}$ be distinct elements of $\Theta_1^{N_1}\times\cdots\times\Theta_k^{N_k}$. Then $z_1=z(\underline{x})$ and $z_2=z(\underline{y})$ are $(t_k,3\epsilon)$ separated points.*

Proof. Since $\underline{x}\neq\underline{y}$, there exists i,j, such that $x_j^i\neq y_j^i$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}d_{n_i}(x_j^i,T^{t_{i-1}+(j-1)(n_i+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_i}p(x,n_i,\frac{\epsilon}{4}))}z_1)<\frac{\epsilon}{4},\\ d_{n_i}(y_j^i,T^{t_{i-1}+(j-1)(n_i+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_i}p(x,n_i,\frac{\epsilon}{4}))}z_2)<\frac{\epsilon}{4}.\end{aligned}$$

Together with $d_{n_i}(x_j^i,y_j^i)>4\epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}d_{t_k}(z_1,z_2)\geq&d_{n_i}(T^{t_{i-1}+(j-1)(n_i+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_i}p(x,n_i,\frac{\epsilon}{4}))}z_1,T^{t_{i-1}+(j-1)(n_i+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_i}p(x,n_i,\frac{\epsilon}{4}))}z_2)\\ \geq&4\epsilon-\frac{\epsilon}{4}-\frac{\epsilon}{4}>3\epsilon.\end{aligned}$$

□

We now define the measures on F which yield the required estimates for the pressure distribution principle. For each $z\in L_k$, we associate a number $\mathcal{L}_k(z)\in(0,\infty)$. Using these numbers as weights, we define, for each k, an atomic measure centered on L_k. Precisely, if $z=z(\underline{x}_1,\cdots,\underline{x}_k)$, we define

$$\mathcal{L}_k(z):=\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_1)\cdots\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_k),$$

where if $\underline{x}_i=(x_1^i,\cdots,x_{N_i}^i)\in\Theta_i^{N_i}$, then

$$\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_i):=\prod_{l=1}^{N_i}\exp S_{n_i}\psi(x_l^i).$$

We define $\nu_k:=\sum\limits_{z\in L_k}\delta_z\mathcal{L}_k(z)$. We normalize ν_k to obtain a sequence of probability measures μ_k. More precisely, we let $\mu_k:=\frac{1}{\kappa_k}\nu_k$, where κ_k is the normalizing constant $\kappa_k:=\sum\limits_{z\in L_k}\mathcal{L}_k(z)=\sum\limits_{\underline{x}_1\in\Theta_1^{N_1}}\cdots\sum\limits_{\underline{x}_k\in\Theta_k^{N_k}}\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_1)\cdots\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_k)=M_1^{N_1}\cdots M_k^{N_k}$. In order to prove the main result of this article, we present some lemmas.

Lemma 2.6. *Suppose ν is a limit measure of the sequence of probability measures μ_k. Then $\nu(F) = 1$.*

Proof. Suppose $\nu = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mu_{l_k}$ for $l_k \to \infty$. For any fixed l and all $p \geq 0$, $\mu_{l+p}(F_l) = 1$ since $F_{l+p} \subset F_l$. Thus, $\nu(F_l) \geq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \mu_{l_k}(F_l) = 1$. It follows that $\nu(F) = \lim_{l\to\infty} \nu(F_l) = 1$. □

Let $\mathcal{B} = B_n(q, \epsilon/2)$ be an arbitrary ball which intersects F. Let k be the unique number which satisfies $t_k \leq n < t_{k+1}$. Let $j \in \{0, \cdots, N_{k+1} - 1\}$ be the unique number so

$$t_k + (n_{k+1} + \max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}} p(x, n_{k+1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))j \leq n < t_k + (n_{k+1} + \max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}} p(x, n_{k+1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))(j+1).$$

We assume that $j \geq 1$ and the simpler case $j = 0$ is similar.

Lemma 2.7. *For any $p \geq 1$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mu_{k+p}(\mathcal{B}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\kappa_k M_{k+1}^j} \exp\left\{ S_n\psi(q) + 2nVar(\psi, \epsilon) + \|\psi\|(\sum_{i=1}^{k} N_i \max_{x\in\Theta_i} p(x, n_i, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \right. \\
&\left. + j \max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}} p(x, n_{k+1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) + n_{k+1} + \max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}} p(x, n_{k+1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4})) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Case $p = 1$. Suppose $\mu_{k+1}(\mathcal{B}) > 0$, then $L_{k+1} \cap \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$. Let $z = z(\underline{x}, \underline{x}_{k+1}) \in L_{k+1} \cap \mathcal{B}$, where $\underline{x} = (\underline{x}_1, \cdots, \underline{x}_k) \in \Theta_1^{N_1} \times \cdots \times \Theta_k^{N_k}$ and $\underline{x}_{k+1} \in \Theta_{k+1}^{N_{k+1}}$. Let

$$\mathcal{A}_{\underline{x};x_1,\cdots,x_j} = \{z(\underline{x}, y_1, \cdots, y_{N_{k+1}}) \in L_{k+1} : x_1 = y_1, \cdots, x_j = y_j\}.$$

Suppose that $z' = z(\underline{y}, \underline{y}_{k+1}) \in L_{k+1} \cap \mathcal{B}$. Since $d_n(z, z') < \epsilon$, we have $\underline{y} = \underline{x}$ and $x_l = y_l$ for $l \in \{1, \cdots, j\}$. We show that $x_l = y_l$ for $l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, j\}$ and the proof that $\underline{x} = \underline{y}$ is similar. Suppose that $x_l \neq y_l$ and let $a_l = t_k + (l-1)(n_{k+1} + \max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}} p(x, n_{k+1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))$. Then

$$d_{n_{k+1}}(T^{a_l} z, x_l) < \frac{\epsilon}{4} \text{ and } d_{n_{k+1}}(T^{a_l} z', y_l) < \frac{\epsilon}{4}.$$

Since $d_{n_{k+1}}(x_l, y_l) > 4\epsilon$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d_n(z, z') &\geq d_{n_{k+1}}(T^{a_l} z, T^{a_l} z') \\
&\geq d_{n_{k+1}}(x_l, y_l) - d_{n_{k+1}}(T^{a_l} z, x_l) - d_{n_{k+1}}(T^{a_l} z', y_l) > 3\epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradicition. Thus we have

$$\nu_{k+1}(\mathcal{B}) \leq \sum_{z\in\mathcal{A}_{\underline{x};x_1,\cdots,x_j}} \mathcal{L}_{k+1}(z) = \mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_1) \cdots \mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_k) \prod_{l=1}^{j} \exp S_{n_{k+1}}\psi(x_l^{k+1}) M_{k+1}^{N_{k+1}-j},$$

Case $p > 1$. Similarly,

$$\nu_{k+p}(\mathcal{B}) \le \mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_1)\cdots\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_k)\prod_{l=1}^{j}\exp S_{n_{k+1}}\psi(x_l^{k+1})M_{k+1}^{N_{k+1}-j}M_{k+2}^{N_{k+2}}\cdots M_{k+p}^{N_{k+p}}.$$

Since for all $i \in \{1,\cdots,k\}$ and all $l \in \{1,\cdots,N_i\}$,

$$d_{n_i}(T^{t_{i-1}+(l-1)(n_i+\max\limits_{x\in\Theta_i}p(x,n_i,\frac{\epsilon}{4}))}z, x_l^i) < \frac{\epsilon}{4},$$

we have

$$\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_1)\cdots\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_k) \le \exp\left\{S_{t_k}\psi(z) + t_k\mathrm{Var}(\psi,\epsilon) + \sum_{i=1}^{k}N_i\max_{x\in\Theta_i}p(x,n_i,\frac{\epsilon}{4})\|\psi\|\right\}.$$

Similarly,

$$\prod_{l=1}^{j}\exp S_{n_{k+1}}(x_l^{k+1}) \le \exp\left\{S_{n-t_k}\psi(T^{t_k}z) + (n-t_k)\mathrm{Var}(\psi,\epsilon)\right.$$
$$\left. + j\max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}}p(x,n_{k+1},\frac{\epsilon}{4})\|\psi\| + (n_{k+1}+\max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}}p(x,n_{k+1},\frac{\epsilon}{4}))\|\psi\|\right\}.$$

Combining with the fact $d_n(z,q) < \epsilon$, we obtain

$$\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_1)\cdots\mathcal{L}(\underline{x}_k)\prod_{l=1}^{j}\exp S_{n_{k+1}}\psi(x_l^{k+1})$$
$$\le \exp\left\{S_n\psi(q) + 2nVar(\psi,\epsilon) + \|\psi\|(\sum_{i=1}^{k}N_i\max_{x\in\Theta_i}p(x,n_i,\frac{\epsilon}{4})\right.$$
$$\left. + j\max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}}p(x,n_{k+1},\frac{\epsilon}{4}) + n_{k+1} + \max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}}p(x,n_{k+1},\frac{\epsilon}{4}))\right\}.$$

Since $\mu_{k+p} = \frac{1}{\kappa_{k+p}}\nu_{k+p}$ and $\kappa_{k+p} = \kappa_k M_{k+1}^{N_{k+1}}\cdots M_{k+p}^{N_{k+p}}$, the desired result follows. □

Lemma 2.8. *For sufficiently large n,*

$$\limsup_{l\to\infty}\mu_l(B_n(q,\epsilon/2)) \le \exp\left\{-n(\mathbf{C} - 2\,Var(\psi,\epsilon) - 7\gamma) + S_n\psi(q)\right\}.$$

Proof. From lemma 2.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_k M_{k+1}^j =& M_1^{N_1}\cdots M_k^{N_k}M_{k+1}^j\\
\ge& \exp\{(\mathbf{C}-4\gamma)(N_1n_1 + N_2n_2 + \cdots + N_kn_k + jn_{k+1})\}\\
=& \exp\{(\mathbf{C}-4\gamma)(N_1(n_1+\max_{x\in\Theta_1}p(x,n_1,\frac{\epsilon}{4})) + N_2(n_2+\max_{x\in\Theta_2}p(x,n_2,\frac{\epsilon}{4})) + \cdots\\
&+ N_k(n_k+\max_{x\in\Theta_k}p(x,n_k,\frac{\epsilon}{4})) + j(n_{k+1}+\max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}}p(x,n_{k+1},\frac{\epsilon}{4}))) - D\}\\
=& \exp\{(\mathbf{C}-4\gamma)n - D - E\},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$E = (\mathbf{C} - 4\gamma)(n - t_k - j \max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}} p(x, n_{k+1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4})),$$

$$D = (\mathbf{C} - 4\gamma)(N_1 \max_{x\in\Theta_1} p(x, n_1, \frac{\epsilon}{4})) + \cdots + N_k \max_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x, n_k, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) + j \max_{x\in\Theta_{k+1}} p(x, n_{k+1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4})).$$

Recall that for all k, $\max_{x\in\Theta_k} p(x, n_k, \epsilon/4)/n_k < 1/2^k$. Hence from (2.3) and (2.4) we obtain for sufficiently large n, $|D/n| < \gamma$, $|E/n| < \gamma$.

By lemma 2.7, for sufficiently large n and any $p \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{k+p}(\mathcal{B}) &\leq \frac{1}{\kappa_k M_{k+1}^j} \exp\left\{ S_n\psi(q) + n(2\mathrm{Var}(\psi,\epsilon) + \gamma) \right\} \\ &\leq \exp\left\{ -n(\mathbf{C} - 2\mathrm{Var}(\psi,\epsilon) - 7\gamma) + S_n\psi(q) \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence the desired results follows. □

Applying the generalized pressure distribution principle, we have

$$P(\widehat{X}(\varphi, T), \psi) \geq P(F, \psi, \epsilon) \geq \mathbf{C} - 2\mathrm{Var}(\psi, \epsilon) - 7\gamma.$$

Recall that $\mathrm{Var}(\psi, \epsilon) < \gamma$, we have

$$P(\widehat{X}(\varphi, T), \psi) \geq P(F, \psi, \epsilon) \geq \mathbf{C} - 9\gamma.$$

Since γ and ϵ were arbitrary, the proof of theorem 1.2 is complete.

3 Modification to obtain theorem 1.1

Fix a small $\gamma > 0$. Let $\mu_1 \in E(K, T)$ and satisfes $h_{\mu_1} + \int \psi d\mu_1 > \mathbf{C} - \gamma/2$. Let $\nu \in E(K, T)$ satisfies $\int \varphi d\mu_1 \neq \int \varphi d\nu$. Let $\mu_2 = t_1\mu_1 + t_2\nu$ where $t_1 + t_2 = 1$ and $t_1 \in (0, 1)$ is chosen sufficiently close to 1 so that $h_{\mu_2} + \int \psi d\mu_2 > \mathbf{C} - \gamma$. Obviously, $\int \varphi d\mu_1 \neq \int \varphi d\mu_2$. Choose $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small so

$$\left| \int \varphi d\mu_1 - \int \varphi d\mu_2 \right| > 4\delta.$$

Let $\epsilon > 0$. Choose a strictly decreasing sequence $\delta_k \to 0$ with $\delta_1 < \delta$. For k odd, we choose a strictly increasing sequence $l_k \to \infty$ so the set

$$Y_k := \left\{ x \in K : \left| \frac{1}{n} S_n\varphi(x) - \int \varphi d\mu_1 \right| < \delta_k, \frac{p(x, n, \epsilon/4)}{n} < \frac{1}{2^k} \text{ for all } n \geq l_k \right\}$$

satisfies $\mu_1(Y_k) > 1-\gamma$ for every k. For k even, we let $Y_{k,1} := Y_{k-1}$ and find $l_k > l_{k-1}$ so that each of the sets

$$Y_{k,2} := \left\{ x \in K : \left| \frac{1}{n} S_n \varphi(x) - \int \varphi d\nu \right| < \delta_k, \frac{p(x,n,\epsilon/4)}{n} < \frac{1}{2^k} \text{ for all } n \geq l_k \right\}$$

satisfies $\nu(Y_{k,2}) > 1-\gamma$. The proof of the following lemma is similar to that of lemma 2.3.

Lemma 3.1. *For any small sufficiently $\epsilon > 0$ and k even, we can find a sequence $\widehat{n}_k \to \infty$ so $[t_i \widehat{n}_k] \geq l_k$ for $i = 1, 2$ and sets Θ_k^i so that Θ_k^i is a $([t_i \widehat{n}_k], 4\epsilon)$ separated set for $Y_{k,i}$ with $M_k^i := \sum_{x \in \Theta_k^i} \exp\left\{ \sum_{j=0}^{[t_i \widehat{n}_k]-1} \psi(T^j x) \right\}$ satisfying*

$$M_k^1 \geq \exp\left([t_1 \widehat{n}_k](h_{\mu_1} + \int \psi d\mu_1 - 4\gamma) \right),$$
$$M_k^2 \geq \exp\left([t_2 \widehat{n}_k](h_{\nu} + \int \psi d\nu - 4\gamma) \right).$$

Then for any $x \in \Theta_k^i$, $\frac{p(x,[t_i n_k],\epsilon/4)}{[t_i n_k]} < \frac{1}{2^k}$, where $i = 1, 2$.

For k even, let

$$\Theta_k = \Theta_k^1 \times \Theta_k^2, M_k = M_k^1 M_k^2 \text{ and } n_k = [t_1 \widehat{n}_k] + \max_{x \in \Theta_k^1} p(x, [t_1 \widehat{n}_k], \frac{\epsilon}{4}) + [t_2 \widehat{n}_k].$$

Then $n_k / \widehat{n}_k \to 1$. For k odd, the corresponding ingredients are obtained by lemma 2.3. Given our new construction of Θ_k, the rest of our construction goes through unchanged. For example, let

$$\underline{x}_1 = (x_1^1, x_2^1, \cdots, x_{N_1}^1) \in \Theta_1^{N_1},$$
$$\underline{x}_2 = ((x_1^{2,1}, x_1^{2,2}), (x_2^{2,1}, x_2^{2,2}), \cdots, (x_{N_2}^{2,1}, x_{N_2}^{2,2})) \in (\Theta_2^1 \times \Theta_2^2)^{N_2}.$$

Then for $(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2) \in \Theta_1^{N_1} \times \Theta_2^{N_2}$, by the non-uniform specification property, we have

$$B(\underline{x}_1) = \bigcap_{j=1}^{N_1} T^{-(j-1)(n_1 + \max_{x \in \Theta_1} p(x, n_1, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))} B_{n_1}(x_j^1, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \neq \emptyset.$$

Let $t_1 = N_1(n_1 + \max_{x \in \Theta_1} p(x, n_1, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))$, then

$$\begin{aligned} B(\underline{x}_1, \underline{x}_2) = & \bigcap_{j=1}^{N_1} T^{-(j-1)(n_1 + \max_{x \in \Theta_1} p(x, n_1, \frac{\epsilon}{4}))} B_{n_1}(x_j^1, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \cap \\ & T^{-t_1} B_{[t_1 \widehat{n}_2]}(x_1^{2,1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \cap T^{-t_1 - [t_1 \widehat{n}_2] - \max_{x \in \Theta_2^1} p(x, [t_1 \widehat{n}_2], \frac{\epsilon}{4})} B_{[t_2 \widehat{n}_2]}(x_1^{2,2}, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \cap \cdots \cap \\ & T^{-t_1 - (N_2 - 1)(n_2 + \max_{x \in \Theta_2^2} p(x, [t_2 \widehat{n}_2], \frac{\epsilon}{4}))} B_{[t_1 \widehat{n}_2]}(x_{N_2}^{2,1}, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \cap \\ & T^{-t_1 - (N_2 - 1)(n_2 + \max_{x \in \Theta_2^2} p(x, [t_2 \widehat{n}_2], \frac{\epsilon}{4})) - [t_1 \widehat{n}_2] - \max_{x \in \Theta_2^1} p(x, [t_1 \widehat{n}_2], \frac{\epsilon}{4})} B_{[t_2 \widehat{n}_2]}(x_{N_2}^{2,2}, \frac{\epsilon}{4}) \neq \emptyset. \end{aligned}$$

For k even, let $\underline{x}_k = ((x_1^{k,1}, x_1^{k,2}), (x_2^{k,1}, x_2^{k,2}), \cdots, (x_{N_k}^{k,1}, x_{N_k}^{k,2})) \in \Theta_k^{N_k} = (\Theta_k^1 \times \Theta_k^2)^{N_k}$. Then for $j \in \{1, \cdots, N_k\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| S_{[t_1\widehat{n}_k]}\varphi(x_j^{k,1}) + S_{[t_2\widehat{n}_k]}\varphi(x_j^{k,2}) - n_k \int \varphi d\mu_2 \right| \\
\leq &\left| S_{[t_1\widehat{n}_k]}\varphi(x_j^{k,1}) + S_{[t_2\widehat{n}_k]}\varphi(x_j^{k,2}) - \widehat{n}_k \int \varphi d\mu_2 \right| + \left| \widehat{n}_k \int \varphi d\mu_2 - n_k \int \varphi d\mu_2 \right| \\
\leq &\left| S_{[t_1\widehat{n}_k]}\varphi(x_j^{k,1}) - [t_1\widehat{n}_k] \int \varphi d\mu_1 \right| + \left| S_{[t_2\widehat{n}_k]}\varphi(x_j^{k,2}) - [t_2\widehat{n}_k] \int \varphi d\nu \right| + 2\|\varphi\| \\
+ &\left| \widehat{n}_k \int \varphi d\mu_2 - n_k \int \varphi d\mu_2 \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\left| \frac{S_{[t_1\widehat{n}_k]}\varphi(x_j^{k,1}) + S_{[t_2\widehat{n}_k]}\varphi(x_j^{k,2})}{n_k} - \int \varphi d\mu_2 \right| \to 0.$$

Thus we can modify the proof of lemma 2.4 to ensure that our construction still gives rise to points in $\widehat{X}(\varphi, T)$. Obviously $n_k/\widehat{n}_k \to 1$ and $[t_i\widehat{n}_k]/t_i\widehat{n}_k \to 1$ for $i = 1, 2$. Hence for sufficiently large k, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
M_k \geq &\exp\{[t_1\widehat{n}_k](h_{\mu_1} + \int \psi d\mu_1 - 4\gamma) + [t_2\widehat{n}_k](h_\nu + \int \psi d\nu - 4\gamma)\} \\
\geq &\exp\{(1-\gamma)\widehat{n}_k(t_1(h_{\mu_1} + \int \psi d\mu_1) + t_2(h_\nu + \int \psi d\mu_1) - 4\gamma)\} \\
\geq &\exp(1-\gamma)^2 n_k(h_{\mu_2} + \int \psi d\mu_2 - 4\gamma) \geq \exp(1-\gamma)^2 n_k(\mathbf{C} - 5\gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

Our arrival at the second line and the third line is because we are able to add in the extra terms with an arbitrarily small change to the constant s. Since γ was arbitrary, we can modify the estimates in lemma 2.8 to cover this more general construction.

4 Some Applications

In this section, by the work of Paulo Varandas [28], Theorem 1.1 can be applied to multidimensional local diffeomorphisms and Viana maps. The BS dimension (introduced by Barreira and Schmeling) of multifractal decomposition set is also studied in this section.

Example 1 Mltidimensional local diffeomorphisms Let T_0 be an expanding map in $\mathbb{T}^n$ and take a periodic point p for T_0. Let T be a C^1-local diffeomorphism obtained from T_0 by a bifurcation in a small neighborhood U of p in such a way that:

(1) every point $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$ has some preimage outside U;

(2) $\|DT(x)^{-1}\| \leq \sigma^{-1}$ for every $x \in \mathbb{T}^n \setminus U$, and $\|DT(x)^{-1}\| \leq L$ for every $x \in \mathbb{T}^n$ where $\sigma > 1$ is large enough or $L > 0$ is sufficiently close to 1;

(3) T is topologically exact: for every open set U there is $N \geq 1$ for which $T^N(U) = \mathbb{T}^n$.

From [28] and [29], we know T has a unique (ergodic) equilibrium m for Hölder continuous potential $-\log|detDT|$ and (T, m) satisfies non-uniform specification property.

Corollary 4.1. *Let m be the unique ergodic equilibrium state for Hölder continuous potential $-\log|detDT|$ in multidimensional local diffeomorphisms. If $\varphi \in C(\mathbb{T}^n)$ satisfies $\inf_{\mu\in M(K,T)} \int \varphi d\mu < \sup_{\mu\in M(K,T)} \int \varphi d\mu$, then*

$$P(\widehat{\mathbb{T}^n}(\varphi, T), -\log|detDT|) = P(\mathbb{T}^n, -\log|detDT|).$$

If $\psi > 0$, then

$$BS(\widehat{\mathbb{T}^n}(\varphi, T), -\log|detDT|) = \sup\left\{h_\nu / \int \psi d\nu : \nu \in M(K, T)\right\}.$$

Example 2 Viana maps In [30], the author introduced Viana maps which are obtained as C^3 small perturbations of the skew product ϕ_α of the cylinder $S^1 \times I$ given by

$$\phi_\alpha(\theta, x) = (d\theta(\mathrm{mod}1), 1 - ax^2 + \alpha\cos(2\pi\theta))$$

where $d \geq 16$ is an integer, a is a Misiurewicz parameter for the quadratic family, and α is small.

Paulo Varandas [28] proved that when m is SRB measure for ϕ_α, then (ϕ_α, m) satisfies non-uniform specification.

Corollary 4.2. *If m is SRB measure for a Viana map ϕ_α and $\varphi \in C(S^1 \times I)$ satisfies $\inf_{\mu\in M(K,\phi_\alpha)} \int \varphi d\mu < \sup_{\mu\in M(K,\phi_\alpha)} \int \varphi d\mu$, then for any $\psi \in C(S^1 \times I)$*

$$P(\widehat{S^1 \times I}(\varphi, \phi_\alpha), \psi) \geq \sup\left\{h_\nu + \int \psi d\nu : \nu \in M(K, \phi_\alpha)\right\}.$$

If $\psi > 0$, then

$$BS(\widehat{S^1 \times I}(\varphi, \phi_\alpha), \psi) \geq \sup\left\{h_\nu / \int \psi d\nu : \nu \in M(K, \phi_\alpha)\right\}.$$

If there exists $\mu \in M(K, T)$ such that μ is a equilibrium state for ϕ_α with respect to potential $\psi \in C(X)$, then we have $P(\widehat{S^1 \times I}(\varphi, \phi_\alpha), \psi) = P(S^1 \times I, \psi)$.

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for carefully reading our paper and providing suggestions for improvement. The work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant No. 11271191) and National Basic Research Program of China (grant No. 2013CB834100) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (grant No. WK0010000035).

References

[1] L. Barreira and J. Schmeling, Sets of non-typical points have full topological entropy and full Hausdorff dimension, *Israel J. Math.*, **116** (2000), 29–70.

[2] L. Barreira & Y. Pesin, Nonuniform hyperbolicity, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge(2007).

[3] L. Barreira & B. Saussol, Variational principles and mixed multifractal spectra, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **353** (2001), 3919–3944.

[4] L. Barreira, B. Saussol & J. Schmeling, Higher-dimensional multifractal analysis, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **81** (2002), 67–91.

[5] E. Chen, T. Kupper & L. Shu, Topological entropy for divergence points, *Ergodic Theory Dynamical Systems* **25** (2005), 1173–1208.

[6] E. Chen and J. Xiong, The pointwise dimension of self-similar measures, *Chin. Sci. Bull.* **44** (1999), 2136–2140.

[7] Y. Chung & H. Takahasi, Multifractal formalism for Benedicks-Carleson quadratic maps, *Ergodic Theory Dynamical Systems* DOI:10.1017/etds.2012.188 (2013).

[8] A. Fan, D. Feng and J. Wu, Recurrence, dimension and entropy. *J. London Math. Soc.* **64** (2001), 229–244.

[9] A. Fan, L. Liao and J. Peyriere. Generic points in systems of specification and Banach valued Birkhoff ergodic average, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst.* **21** (2008), 1103–1128.

[10] D. Feng, K. Lau and J. Wu, Ergodic limits on the conformal repellers, *Adv. Math.* **169** (2002), 58–91.

[11] A. Johansson, T. Jordan, A. Oberg and M. Pollicott, Multifractal analysis of non-uniformly hyperbolic systems, *Israel J. Mathematics* **177(1)** (2010), 125–144.

[12] T. Jordan & M. Rams, Multifractal analysis of weak Gibbs measures for non-uniformly expanding C^1 maps, *Ergodic Theory Dynamical Systems* **31(1)** (2011), 143–164.

[13] C. Liang, G. Liao, W. Sun and X. Tian, Saturated sets for nonuniformly hyperbolic systems. Preprint.

[14] K. Oliveira, Every expanding measure has the non-uniform specification property, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **140** (2012), 1309–1320.

[15] K. Oliveira & M. Viana, Thermodynamical formalism for robust classes of potentials and non-uniformly hyperbolic maps, *Ergodic Theory and Dynamical Systems* **28** (2008), 501–533.

[16] L. Olsen, Multifractal analysis of divergence points of deformed measure theoretical Birkhoff averages. IV: Divergence points and packing dimension, *Bull. Sci. Math.* **132** (2008), 650–678.

[17] L. Olsen & S. Winter, Multifractal analysis of divergence points of deformed measure theoretical Birkhoff averages. II: Non-linearity, divergence points and Banach space valued spectra, *Bull. Sci. Math.* **131** (2007), 518–558.

[18] Y. Pei & E. Chen, On the variational principle for the topological pressure for certain non-compact sets, *Sci. China Ser. A* **53(4)** (2010), 1117–1128.

[19] Y. Pesin, *Dimension Theory in Dynamical Systems*, Contemporary Views and Applications. Univ. of Chicago Press, 1997.

[20] C. Pfister & W. Sullivan, Large deviations estimates for dynamical systems without the specification property. Applications to the β-shifts, *Nonlinearity* **18** (2005) 237–261.

[21] C. Pfister & W. Sullivan, On the topological entropy of saturated sets, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **27** (2007) 929–956.

[22] D. Ruelle, Historic behaviour in smooth dynamical systems, in: H. Broer, B. Krauskopf, G. Vegter (Eds.), Global Analysis of Dynamical Systems, Institute of Physics, London, 2001, 63–66.

[23] F. Takens, Orbits with historic behavior, or non-existence of averages, *Nonlinearity* **21**, (2008), 33–36.

[24] F. Takens & E. Verbitskiy, On the variational principle for the topological entropy of certain non-compact sets, *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **23(1)** (2003) 317–348.

[25] D. Thompson, The irregular set for maps with the specification property has full topological pressure, *Dynamical Systems: An International Journal* **25(1)** (2010) 25–51.

[26] D. Thompson, A variational principle for topological pressure for certain non-compact sets, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **80(3)** (2009) 585–602.

[27] D. Thompson, Irregular sets, the beta-transformation and the almost specification property, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **364** (2012) 5395–5414.

[28] P. Varandas, Non-uniform specification and large deviations for weak Gibbs measures. *J. Stat. Phys.* **146** (2012), 330–358.

[29] P. Varandas & M. Viana, Existence, uniquness and stability of equilibrium states for non-uniformly expanding maps. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré, Anal. Non Linéaire* **27** (2010), 555–593.

[30] M. Viana, Multidimensional nonhyperbolic attrators. *Publ. Math. IHÉS* **85** (1997), 63–96.

[31] K. Yamamoto, On the weaker forms of the specification property and their applications, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **137** (2009), 3807–3814.

[32] X. Zhou & E. Chen, Multifractal analysis for the historic set in topological dynamical systems, *Nonlinearity* **26** (2013), 1975–1997.

[33] X. Zhou, E. Chen & W. Cheng, Packing entropy and divergence points, *Dynamical Systems: An International Journal* **27(3)** (2012), 387–402.